1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY	
3	KUMAR, et al., CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:	
4	Plaintiffs, 3:21-cv-11048-GC-TJB vs.	
5	BOCHASANWASI SHRI AKSHAR PURUSHOTTAM TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	
6	SWAMINARAYAN SANSTHA, INC., et al.,	
7	Defendants. COURTROOM 5E	
8	Clarkson S. Fisher Building & U.S. Courthouse	
9	402 East State Street Trenton, New Jersey 08608	
10	Thursday, August 10, 2023 Commencing at 11:02 a.m.	
11		
12	B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE GEORGETTE CASTNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
13	APPEARANCES:	
14	KAKALEC LAW, PLLC	
15		
16	195 Montague Street, 14th Floor Brooklyn, NY 11201	
17	For the Plaintiffs	
18	JAFFE GLENN LAW GROUP, P.A. BY: ANDREW GLENN, ESQUIRE	
19	300 Carnegie Center, Suite 150 Princeton, NJ 08540	
20	For the Plaintiffs	
21		
22	Kimberly Wilson, Federal Official Court Reporter	
23	Kimberly Wilson, rederal Official Court Reporter Kimberly_Wilson@njd.uscourts.gov (609) 815-2751	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript	
25	produced by computer-aided transcription.	

```
1
     APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
    RADFORD & KEEBAUGH, LLC
 3
    BY: DANIEL WERNER, ESQUIRE
     315 W. Ponce de Leon Avenue, #1080
 4
     Decatur, GA 30030
     For the Plaintiffs
 5
    ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP
 6
    BY: PAUL JOSEPH FISHMAN, ESQUIRE
    BY: AIDAN MULRY, ESQUIRE
 7
    One Gateway Center, Suite 1025
    Newark, NJ 07102
 8
    For the Defendants
 9
    WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP
    BY: GARY D. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE
10
    767 Fifth Avenue
    New York, NY 10153
11
     For the Defendants
12
13
    Also Present:
14
    Ann Dello Iacono, The Courtroom Deputy
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
          (PROCEEDINGS held via remote teleconferencing before The
 2
     Honorable Georgette Castner, United States District Judge, at
 3
     11:02 a.m. as follows:)
 4
               THE COURT: Good morning, Counsel.
               We are on the record in Docket No. 21-cv-11048.
 5
 6
               May I have appearances of counsel, please, beginning
 7
     with plaintiff?
 8
               MS. KAKALEC: Good morning, Your Honor, Patricia
 9
     Kakalec from Kakalec Law for the plaintiff.
10
               THE COURT: Anyone else?
11
               MR. GLENN: Good morning. Andy Glenn from Jaffe
12
     Glenn Law Group, Your Honor, on behalf of plaintiffs.
13
               MS. KAKALEC: Your Honor, also with me are Hugh Baran
14
     from Kakalec Law and Daniel Werner from Radford & Keebaugh.
15
               THE COURT: Good morning, Counsel.
16
               And for defendants?
17
               MR. FISHMAN: Good morning, Your Honor, Paul Fishman
18
     from Arnold & Porter on behalf of most of the defendants, as
19
     you can tell from our -- from our letter, but not the two
20
     defendants that are in India.
21
               MR. FRIEDMAN: And, Judge, Gary Friedman with Weil
22
     Gotshal & Manges. Our appearance in the case -- our formal
2.3
     appearance in the case will be forthcoming for most of the
     defendants.
24
25
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Just so I'm clear, there are
```

```
1
     defendants who are currently not represented by counsel at this
 2
    point?
 3
               MR. FISHMAN: No, there are defendants who haven't
 4
     been served yet. But the plaintiffs can articulate that, I
 5
     think.
               MS. KAKALEC: Yes, Your Honor. There's two
 6
 7
     defendants who are located in India. And we have served them
 8
     or were attempting to serve them through the Hague Convention.
     We filed -- we delivered the papers for that May 11th of
 9
10
     2020 -- oh, I'm sorry, in April of 2022.
               (Court reporter clarification.)
11
12
               MS. KAKALEC: So, my apologies, the service requests
13
     were delivered with the Central Authority of India pursuant to
14
     the Haque Service Convention in April 2022. We have confirmed
15
     delivery. We have made attempts to find out the status, but we
16
     haven't received a response. So it still has not been served
17
     through the Hague Convention.
18
               We understand from others we have talked to about
19
     this that it usually takes over a year in India. It's been
20
     several months over a year, but they still have not been served
21
    by the Central Authority.
22
               THE COURT: Okay.
23
               MR. FISHMAN: And, Judge, this is Paul Fishman, just
24
     to be clear, those two defendants who are not appearing here,
25
     and who neither Arnold & Porter, nor Weil Gotshal represents,
```

```
1
     is BAPS, an India Public Trust, and an individual named Harshad
 2
     Chavda.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Friedman, you anticipate
 4
     entering an appearance on behalf of whom?
               MR. FRIEDMAN: On behalf of the same parties that
 5
 6
     Arnold & Porter is representing. We are co-counsel with Arnold
 7
     & Porter.
               MR. FISHMAN: And they have been for a while, Judge.
 8
     And Mr. Friedman and I have both had dealings with plaintiffs'
 9
10
     counsel over time.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure I just
     have an understanding as to -- this is a new case for me, just
12
13
     getting up to speed.
14
               I've reviewed the parties' letters that were filed on
15
     the docket, and including the one as recently as I believe last
16
     night.
17
               (Court reporter clarification.)
18
                           Including the docket -- the letter that
               THE COURT:
19
     was filed yesterday by plaintiff dated August 9th as the docket
20
     entry 39.
21
               Based on my review of that document -- that letter,
     it appears to me that we have some direction going forward,
22
2.3
     which is that plaintiffs are going to file a motion to withdraw
     as counsel. And then at that point, if there's discovery
24
25
     that's being requested or a request for a stay in the case,
```

```
1
     that plaintiffs could seek to file an application with the
     Court at that time and make that request.
 2
 3
               (Court reporter clarification.)
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Okay, Kim, this is the Judge. And I had
 5
     said that based on my review of the letter in docket entry 39,
 6
     that the parties -- or that plaintiffs' counsel has set forth
 7
     what the next step should be in the case, which is to file a
 8
    motion to withdraw as counsel. To the extent that there's a
     request for -- to lift a stay in this civil case and request
 9
10
     discovery, that the plaintiffs could file an application in
11
     that regard. Or if they have a new attorney that wants to
12
     appear on their behalf, that that attorney could file an
13
     appearance and file such application.
14
               And then I believe Ms. Kakalec was going to interject
15
     there.
16
               MS. KAKALEC: Yes, Your Honor. We would file that
17
    motion by the end of next week, if that's acceptable to the
18
     Court?
19
               THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to request that the
20
     application be filed no later than August 16th.
21
               MS. KAKALEC: Yes, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything further that you
2.3
     need or request -- I don't have any other applications -- or I
     don't have any applications before me at this time on anything
24
25
     further for the Court to address.
```

2.3

MR. FISHMAN: Well, Judge, this is Paul Fishman from Arnold & Porter on behalf of the defendants.

Your Honor, I think in the letter that counsel for the plaintiffs sent last evening, they -- essentially, what they said is it seems clear -- everybody seems clear the direction for these 12 plaintiffs, who are now in India, that they want two things: They want to remove themselves as plaintiffs in the case. I mean, it's up to Ms. Kakalec and her colleagues to do that. And then they would like to terminate their relationship with them.

It appears from the letter that we received last evening that the lawyers are willing to do the second of those things, to withdraw as counsel for their former -- soon to be former clients, but not to implement the clear instructions from their clients to move to dismiss them first.

They've cited a case that they say prevents them from doing that. I read the case quickly this morning. I don't see that it does that at all. That case involves when the Court has a role in approval of a settlement in which there are various issues and other class members that may be at risk. But as they pointed out in their letter to the Court, they still represent other putative class plaintiffs in this case. And they continue to do that, although, of course, with whatever in the context of the case was stayed by Judge Thompson with consent of the parties almost two years ago.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But leaving that aside for the moment, as I read Rule 41, which basically says you can -- somebody can basically get out of the case as a plaintiff if they want, I actually don't understand how they can leave their clients in this limbo when their clients have specifically said to them, we want you to move to dismiss the case. And so I understand what the Court said, but what that means is that these 12 plaintiffs who are -- who have lawyers who are on this call, are now going to be left without lawyers and will have to find new lawyers to seek relief that they have already expressed that they want. And that's where we are. And so I don't actually understand why it is that plaintiffs' counsel can't or shouldn't make that motion now, orally or in writing, and that the Court could then -- it would be unopposed by the defendants -- and the Court can then grant that application before letting them out of the case. MS. KAKALEC: Your Honor, if I could? At the very least, there is --Identify yourself for the record so the THE COURT: court reporter can keep track of who's speaking. MS. KAKALEC: I apologize. This is Patricia Kakalec. At the very least, there is a conflict of interest under Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7 between the individuals

who now say they want to leave the case and the other nine

plaintiffs still in the case.

2.3

These are all things we were going to address in our written application to the Court. And so, frankly, if Mr. Fishman and their clients wish to defend on that, they can put that submission in to the Court in writing, as they should.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, Mr. Fishman, before me there is no motion or application for me to decide at this point. When counsel files her motion to withdraw, if you're opposing that, you could submit something in response.

I am concerned, when the first letters were received, the plaintiffs had asked to just terminate the attorney-client relationship. It wasn't until the plaintiff -- I received this new letter that they are now asking me to have them withdrawn from the case prior to them terminating the relationship.

I think we can get there, the end result, the same way. We just might have to take a different path, which is that they withdraw as counsel. The plaintiff, either through counsel, their new counsel which they indicate that they have, or pro se, can then file an application seeking to withdraw their claims. I think we get there the same way, just maybe a different, a different route.

But right now before me there is no motion or application for me to decide. So if the parties would like to file a motion, you can move forward with that and then the Court can make the ruling.

```
1
               MS. KAKALEC:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                     We will file
 2
     that by the 16th.
 3
               THE COURT: Anything further we need to discuss
 4
     before we conclude the call?
 5
               MR. FISHMAN: I do have one -- Paul Fishman, Judge.
 6
               I do have one thing that I do need to bring to the
 7
     attention of everybody, which is that when plaintiffs -- the
 8
     letter from Mr. Glenn and colleagues that was filed last night
     attached correspondence that they had received from Mr. Soni in
 9
10
     India. And that, in turn, attached passport photos and a
11
     variety of other information from these 12 plaintiffs.
12
     Unfortunately, counsel did not file those materials with any
     redactions and they do contain P.I.I., personally identifying
13
14
     information. And my strong view is that that was not the right
     way to do this, and that they should have redacted that. And I
15
16
     would request that they -- that somehow plaintiffs' counsel
     take steps to refile with redactions, because I don't think
17
18
     that that was appropriate in the context of this or any other
19
     case. I'm not suggesting anything inappropriate.
20
               MS. KAKALEC: Your Honor, we did redact -- we did
21
     redact the dates on the passports. We redacted the -- the
22
     months and the day of the birth years as the rule required. If
2.3
     you look at the documents -- I'm just double checking to make
24
     sure --
25
               MR. FISHMAN: I couldn't tell from what we got last
```

```
1
     night.
 2
               MS. KAKALEC:
                             Okay.
 3
               THE COURT: Well, this is a, you know, a late filing
 4
     that the Court has received as well. So what I'm going to do
 5
     is place it under temporary seal. And then I'll request that
 6
     the parties submit an application. There is a significant
 7
     amount of information -- as I'm just looking at it now -- with
 8
     respect to the passport, that I think counsel should take a
 9
     second look at and make sure that the personal information is
10
     properly redacted on the docket. But for now, I will place it
11
     under temporary seal.
12
               MS. KAKALEC:
                            That's fine, Your Honor. We'd be happy
13
     to redact further information from the passports. We believe
14
     we redacted what was required by the rules. We are happy to do
15
     a more in depth redaction.
16
               THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
17
               Anything further we need to discuss before we
18
     conclude the call?
19
               MS. KAKALEC: Not from the plaintiff, Your Honor.
20
               MR. FISHMAN: Paul Fishman. Not for defense, Judge.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counsel. Have a good
22
     day.
2.3
               MS. KAKALEC:
                             Thank you, Your Honor.
          (Hearing concluded at 11:16 a.m.)
24
25
```

1	
2	FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5	
6	/S/ Kimberly Wilson, RMR, CRR 8/21/2023
7	Court Reporter/Transcriber
8	Court Reporter/ Hanseriber
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2 =	